Comment Letter 195

Hingtgen, Robert J

From: Sent: To: Cc:

Howard Cook howard, February 25, 2014 11:00 AM
Hingtgen, Robert J
Danielle Thomas; Howard Cook, Donna Tisdal-, Mark Ostra-der
On line petition on Soltes Oslar Project, log no. 3910 120005
save-san-dlego-countys.pdf

Robert.

Thanks for pointing out that you did not get this Soitec Solar Project petition. You asked me to get it for you in digital format. I looked into it and it is now attached in PDF format. It has the comments for each person who submitted one along with their petition affirm: tion. Let me know if you have any

195-1

Thanks again

Howard W Cook

Response to Comment Letter 195

Howard Cook February 25, 2014

I95-1 This comment is introductory in nature and does not raise an environmental issue for which a response is required. The County acknowledges receipt of the petition and provides the following responses.

October 2015 7345 I95-1

Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife

Dear Dianne Jacob, Supervisor, Greg Cox, Supervisor, Dave Roberts, Supervisor, Ron Roberts, Supervisor, Ashley Gungle, PDS Project Manager, Robert Hingtgen, Environmental Coordinator, and Bill Hom, Supervisor,

We are pleased to present you with this petition affirming this statement:

"To: The Honorable San Diego County Supervisors and San Diego County PDS Soitec Project leaders Please vote "NO PROJECT" to the proposed East County Soitec Solar Project. The "No Project alternative" Is the only recommendation possible at this time. Project size, severe environmental impacts, experimental nature of the CPV product, major impacts to water aquifers; the rushed broad-brush nature of the more important EIR parts makes this the only alternative possible at this time.

Your choice to use the "Fast Track" method, requested in the 03/05/2012 Soitec letter to Chairman Roberts has resulted in an EIR containing many factual errors and omissions as will be reflected in the EIR citizen comments. The project and its EIR must be reworked, reanalyzed using normal non fast track processes.

Our San Diego environment is far more important than the profits or cash flow of the French Soitec Company and the project's absentee landowners. Support solar in urban environments where power is used and on reclaimed/contaminated lands – not on wetlands, in wildlife habitat, along scenic highways or in communities valued for their rural character.

Attached is a list of individuals who have added their names to this petition, as well as additional comments written by the petition signers themselves.

Sincerely, Howard Cook



The County of San Diego (County) acknowledges the commenter's support for the No Project Alternative and for solar in urban areas. See Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DPEIR) Section 4.0 for the County's analysis of alternatives and common response ALT2.

The County disagrees with the commenter's statements that the Proposed Project would have severe environmental impacts or major impacts to water aguifers. DPEIR Table S-2 provides a summary of the potential significant impacts associated with the Projects that are examined in depth in DPEIR Chapter 2.0, as well as the proposed mitigation for these impacts to reduce them to less than significant. Only certain impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, and land use will remain significant and unavoidable. Potential impacts to local aguifers were considered and addressed in DPEIR Sections 3.1.5.3.4, Groundwater Resources, and 3.1.9.3.1, Water. See also common response WR1 and WR2. The County has found that the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on aquifers and groundwater resources.

The County disagrees with the commenter's assertion that it has allowed the "fast tracking" of the Proposed Project. The application for the Proposed Project has been processed by the County according to the County Zoning Ordinance and related regulations.

October 2015 7345

I95-2

195-2

195-3

Final PEIR

195-2

			The information in this comment will be in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.
Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife! Janet Warren Pottero, CA 91963 Feb 23, 2014 Marilyn Burley Pottero, CA 91963 Feb 22, 2014		195-3	This comment introduces the attached list of individuals that have added their names to the petition. The County acknowledges the petition and individual comments submitted by the public. Where comments have been submitted in the petition, a response has been provided. Please see the following responses below.
I grow up in Boulevard in the 70's and 80's. Please don't let these people destroy our back country. Cassandra Hudson (Bebout) Cassandra Hudson Santee, CA 92071 Feb 22, 2014 Diana Sourbeer Valley Center, CA 92082 Feb 22, 2014] 195 -4	195-4	The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The information in this comment will be in the Final EIR for review and
Soitec Project leaders are not telling the truth! We must vote NO on the proposed East County Soitec solar Project. Lets save our aquifers and wildlife! Sandy Zelasko Valley Center, CA 92082-7635	195-5	195-5	consideration by the decision makers. The County acknowledges the commenter's
Feb 21, 2014 Carol Fasching Alpine. CA 91901 Feb 21, 2014		193-3	opposition to the Project. The information in this
S Hoggard Sart Diego, CA 92128 Feb 21, 2014 Sheri Vandeventer			comment will be in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the Decision makers.
Valley Center, CA 92082 Feb 20, 2014 Anne Bessinger Alpine, CA 91901			
Feb 20, 2014 M. A. Mareck Escondido, CA 92026 Feb 19, 2014			
MoveOn.org 2			
		•	

7345 195-3 October 2015

Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife!		I95-6
As a long time property owner in the Ocotillo Wells community, I vigorously oppose the solar project that will further destroy the land and severely impact native wildlife, vegetation and the Ocotillo Wells aquifer. I urge you to reject this project completely.	195-6	
Anne M Casey San Diego, CA 92104 Feb 19, 2014	•	
Kathleen El Cajon, CA 92021 Feb 17, 2014		
Steven Rosefeld Bacondido, CA 92025 Feb 16, 2014		
It is always suspicious when a government agency makes exceptions and "fast tracks" a project that is detrimental to the environment, the aquifer, and the last remaining open spaces in San Diego County. Once again something is trying to slide into the back country that says it is a low impact project but will have far-reaching ramifications. Considering the drought we've been involved in a number of years, with 2014-looking to be a banner year, DO NOT allow this project in the back country. Jan Hedlun	☐ 195-7 ☐ 195-8 ☐ 195-9	
Potrero, CA 91963 Feb 16, 2014 Robert Staart La Mesa, CA 91942 Feb 16, 2014		
Sandra Little Jamul, CA 91935 Feb 16, 2014		
Don't kill another part of our wildlife habitat. Ed	I 195-10	
Duarte, CA 91010 Feb 16, 2014		
Stan El Cajon, CA 92021 Feb 16, 2014		195-7
MoveOn.org 3		

The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The information in this comment will be in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the Decision makers. The County disagrees that the Project would severely impact wildlife, vegetation, and the Ocotillo Wells aquifer. DPEIR Chapter 2.3, Biological Resources and Sections 3.1.5.3.4, Groundwater Resources, and 3.1.9.3.1, Water, detail the County's analysis of these resources. The County found that the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on local aquifers and, with the implementation of proposed mitigation, would have a less than significant impact on biological resources, including wildlife and vegetation.

The County disagrees with the commenter's assertion that it has allowed the "fast tracking" of the Proposed Project. The application for the Proposed Project has been processed by the County according to the County Zoning Ordinance and related regulations. Regarding the commenter's assertion that the Proposed Project is detrimental to the environment and the aquifer, please see the response to comment 195-2.

The County disagrees with the commenter's assertion that the DPEIR concludes that the Project is a "low-impact project". In conformance with CEQA, the DPEIR evaluated the whole of the action and analyzed each environmental subject area with regard to potential

adverse effects, as well as a reasonable range of alternatives. The DPEIR is consistent with the County's EIR Format and General Content Requirements, dated September 26, 2006. The County acknowledges that the Proposed Project would have certain significant and unmitigable impacts.

Potential impacts related to groundwater use were considered and addressed in the DPEIR; see Sections 3.1.5.3.4, Groundwater Resources and 3.1.9.3.1, Water. Also, see common response WR1 and WR2. As stated in Section 3.1.9.3.1, the County will place conditions on the Major Use Permit that will restrict the amount of water that is permitted to be withdrawn from the on-site wells in order to prevent interference with off-site wells. As such, the County does not anticipate that wells of neighboring residents will run dry as a result of the Proposed Project.

195-10 The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The information in this comment will be in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the Decision makers. Potential impacts to wildlife habitat were considered and addressed in DPEIR Chapter 2.3, Biological Resources. The County found that the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on wildlife habitat with the implementation of proposed mitigation.

Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife! I believe that the move to fast track this project is criminal. Would a project with such dire impacts be railroaded in next to a large, affluent community? As a 34 year resident of Jacumba, I am herrified at the callostness of anyones who would think that a project which would have such negative resident on any quality be impacted descree it. NO PROJECT! Sunta Barry Jacumba CA 91934 No. 15, 2014 Cheryl Wilson Descarato, CA 91916 Feb 15, 2014 Tobert harriagon boulevark, CA 91905 Feb 15, 2014 Diver O'Fabetry O'greyy, Pf. 34229 Feb 14, 2014 MoveOn.org MoveOn.org 4	[I95-11	195-11	The County disagrees with the commenter's assertion that it has allowed the "fast tracking" of the Proposed Project. The application for the Proposed Project has been processed by the County according to the County Zoning Ordinance and related regulations. In conformance with CEQA, the DPEIR evaluated the whole of the action and analyzed each environmental subject area with regard to potential adverse effects, as well as a reasonable range of alternatives. The DPEIR is consistent with the County's EIR Format and General Content Requirements, dated September 26, 2006.

October 2015 7345

Final PEIR

Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife

In addition to obstructing mountain vistas, creating fire hazards and destroying habitats, large solar power 195-12 projects take a toll on the area's scarce water supply. Solar panels have to be washed regularly as dust diminishes their effectiveness. In addition, solar projects call for grading the land and sometimes spraying it with chemicals to inhibit dust or plant growth that can reduce the efficiency of solar panels. Materials in the panels likely contain toxins that could leak into groundwater, which is the only source of water in this 195-13 community. There could be a five or ten year latency period before the toxins show up in the aquifers but by then it is too late. By and large local residents strongly oppose these project for health, safety, environmental, aesthetic, ethical and other reasons. The inhabitants should have the freedom to control the area in which they live and not have industrial blight dictated to them by outsiders, especially when the community plan has always called for an open natural country atmosphere. That's why we moved here. We should be able to rely on the agricultural zoning and not have it changed to industrial mid stream. These projects if built should rather be placed in completely uninhabited areas. Alternatively, they could be located next to the populations that would use most of the output, ideally in an already industrialized location. That would be a fair and reasonable way to handle it. Either bother nobody with it or molest only those that want industrial solar electric. Also, roof top point of use solar is a reasonable voluntary method. Presumably the proposed massive industrial complex would be surrounded by chain link fence with barbed wire and prominent high voltage 195-15 signs. The array of a huge landscape of solar panels may be an attraction to rural children break into enter and explore or throw rocks from the outside at the glass. This danger has not been addressed appropriately. There likely are thousands of materials in the solar panel glass, inverters, electrical circuits, wires, connectors, terminal boxes, fuses, circuit breakers, fans, etc. That could create toxic vapors in fires. There has been inadequate analysis of the temperature of the panels. To the extent this could be discovered on the internet, it 195-16 seems that each PV panel can be about 77 degrees Fahrenheit hotter than the surrounding area. That would mean on a 100 degree day, which is not unusual in the summer, the panels would be 177 degrees. There may also be a collective effect from such concentrated heat. This is a high wind area also. Combustible dust, leaves 195-17 and branches would undoubtedly blow on to these baking solar panels and may burst into flames. The proposed project and the ecology in Boulevard are a bad and unnecessary combination. On the contrary, the Imperial Valley projects mostly have dust made of sand and not combustible. The projects in Imperial are 195-18 largely desired if in remote desert locations and they have access to water from the Colorado River and not scarce groundwater. The solvency of developer Soitec has not been adequately addressed. It is relevant to the environmental study. Even if the project were environmentally sound, it would have dire consequences if the 195-19 developer could not meet their financial obligations and have to shut down when partially completed. It is not unusual for solar companies to go bankrupt. Financial experts must analyze this. Any parties that approve another project that has a "Solyndra" like ending will not fair well in upcoming elections

Barrance O Zakar Alpine & Boulevard, CA 91901 Feb 13, 2014

William Mark Casebier Sweet Home, OR 97386 Feb 13, 2014

mario aguilar chula vista, CA 91911 Feb 13, 2014

Suzanne Bitterlich ocotillo, CA 92259 Feb 12, 2014

MoveOn.org

I95-12

The DPEIR analyzes and considers impacts to scenic vistas, wildlife habitat and water supply. These issues are addressed in Chapter 2.1, Aesthetics, Chapter 2.3, Biological Resources, and Chapter 3.1.5, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Section 3.1.9.3.1, Water. Also refer to common response WR1, regarding water demand and supply and panel washing frequency. In addition, the DPEIR analyzes and considers potential hazards associated with construction and operation of the Proposed Project (please see Chapter 3.1.4, Hazards and Hazardous Materials). The County found that the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on groundwater and water supply and with respect to fire hazards. With the implementation of mitigation, the County found that the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on wildlife habitat. The County acknowledges that the Proposed Project would have certain significant and unavoidable impacts to scenic vistas.

I95-13 The County agrees that the Project has potential impacts on biological resources and water quality due to the application of herbicides. These issues are discussed in Chapter 2.3, Biological Resources, of the DPEIR. The County found that the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on biological resources with the implementation of mitigation. The soil binding agent to be used on the Proposed Project site is a water-soluble, vinyl acetate/acrylic

October 2015

7345

Final PEIR

195-7

copolymer—an environmentally safe, non-hazardous material. The County has found that the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on groundwater supply and groundwater quality (DPEIR Sections 3.1.5.3.3, 3.1.5.3.4).

As stated in Chapter 1.0, Project Description, in-place tracker washing would occur every 6 to 8 weeks during evening hours. The application of water to tracker panel surfaces (a closed system) as part of regular operations and maintenance would not degrade panel materials such that panel components would leach potentially hazardous materials and effect groundwater resources.

195-14 The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project. The information in this comment will be in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers. It should be noted that the Proposed Project is consistent with the land use designation of the sites and zoning of the sites upon approval of a Major Use Permit, as well as the Boulevard Subregional Plan Area Community Plan (DPEIR Section 2.5.3.2). The Proposed Project would not change the zoning of the proposed solar farm sites or amend the Community Plan.

The County also acknowledges the commenter's preference for an alternate location for the Proposed Project in either completely uninhabited areas or near

population centers that would purportedly use most of the Proposed Project's electrical output. The applicants have set forth in their development applications the proposed solar farm sites as the Proposed Project to be considered by the County and analyzed in the DPEIR. The County has an obligation under CEQA to analyze a range of reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Project or to the location of the Proposed Project that would both attain most of the objectives of the Proposed Project and avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the Proposed Project (14 CCR 15126.6(a)). An environmental impact report is only required to set forth a range of alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice (14 CCR 15126.6(f)). The County has met this standard by analyzing eight different alternatives to the Proposed Project, including different locations and the No Project Alternative (DPEIR, Chapter 4.0). The applicants reviewed a number of different locations throughout the County and screened these locations for their ability to meet the Proposed Project objectives (DPEIR Chapter 4.0). The County found that locations outside of East San Diego County would not meet most of the Proposed Project objectives, including creating solar energy in the San Diego basin to provide a source of local generation and improve reliability, siting solar facilities in areas within the County that have excellent solar attributes, and supporting the local economy through the creation of high-wage jobs (DPEIR Chapter 1.0).

The County also disagrees that the Proposed Project will "bother" or "molest" residents or other individuals. In most instances, the Proposed Project will not have significant, unmitigated impacts that would directly affect residents and other individuals in the area (see DPEIR, Table S-2, Summary of Significant Impacts). For instance, the Proposed Project will not generate noise or traffic above the County's thresholds of significance (DPEIR, pp. 2.6-58 to 2.6-60, 3.1.8-37 to 3.1.8-38). The Proposed Project would not negatively impact public health or create hazards for the community (DPEIR, pp. 2.2-70 to 2.2-71, 3.1.4-51 to 3.1.4-52). The Proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact on utilities, public services, and groundwater supply (DPEIR, pp. 3.1.5-48 to 3.1.5-56, 3.1.7-30, 3.1.9-22). In addition, the Proposed Project would have a less than significant effect related to parks and recreational facilities and housing (DPEIR, p. 3.2.1-1).

The County acknowledges the Proposed Project's significant and unavoidable impacts to aesthetics. The County also acknowledges potential significant and unavoidable air quality impacts from construction emissions of nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter if there is an overlap in construction between the Rugged and Tierra del Sol solar farms or with other cumulative projects in the area (DPEIR, pp. 2.2-69, 2.2-71). The County has considered mitigation to

reduce all of these potential significant impacts that could have an effect on local residents and has adopted all feasible mitigation measures.

The commenter points to rooftop solar as a reasonable voluntary method. The County's consideration of distributed generation as an alternative to the Proposed Project is found in Section 4.2 of the DPEIR. Please refer to common response ALT2 and the responses to comments O10-102 to O10-113 regarding the County's elimination of the distributed-generation alternative as infeasible.

- This comment raises concerns related to potential public safety effects associated with vandalism of the Proposed Project site by local children. This topic was not evaluated in the DPEIR since it is not related to environmental impacts (see 14 CCR 15131).
- **I95-16** Please refer to response to comment O10-83 regarding the potential for toxic fumes.
- Would introduce possible ignition sources.

 Additionally, the equipment on the sites presents a potential challenge to firefighters due to accessibility issues around the solar equipment and a lack of training and experience in firefighting where such equipment exists. To reduce the risk of fire on the site and improve the effectiveness of an emergency

response should a fire occur on site, site-specific Fire Protection Plans (FPPs) for the Tierra del Sol solar farm (Appendix 3.1.4-5 of the DPEIR) and the Rugged solar farm (Appendix 3.1.4-6 of the DPEIR) have been prepared, will be approved, and will be implemented. The FPPs were prepared by a County-approved California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) consultant in accordance with the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements: Wildland Fire and Fire Protection, dated August 31, 2010. As per PDF-HZ-3, similar site-specific FPPs will be prepared and approved by the San Diego County Fire Authority (SDCFA) for the LanEast and LanWest solar farms prior to approval of a Major Use Permit. With regard to electrical fires, please refer to the response to comment O10-82. With regard to response to fires associated with transmission lines, please refer to the response to comment I1-5.

The commenter suggests that the temperature of solar panels can be about 77 degrees Fahrenheit higher than ambient temperature during summer months but has not provided sources or references for the information. Please refer to response to comment I95-18, below regarding solar panel surface temperatures. As stated below, the panels are not anticipated to cause a rise in temperatures at the site above what would otherwise occur without the Proposed Project.

Therefore, potential hazardous conditions involving dust, leaves and branches and a heat island effect are not anticipated.

The solar modules are lightweight and surrounded by airflow both inside and outside the module. As a result, heat dissipates quickly from a solar panel. As described in Chapter 1.0, Project Description, of the DPEIR, the normal operating temperature for solar modules is 20 degrees Celsius (°C; 68 degrees Fahrenheit (°F)) above ambient temperature; therefore, on a typical summer day at 40°C (104°F), the panel temperature would be approximately 60°C (140°F). When accounting for irradiance (a measure of solar radiation energy received on a given surface area in a given time), wind, and module type, it is expected that the peak module temperatures in the summer would be between 65°C and 70°C (149°F and 158°F), and the peak module temperatures in the winter would be between 35°C and 40°C (95°F and 104°F).

Although the trackers would be hot to the touch as a result of solar energy absorption, trackers are designed to absorb light energy inwards towards the panel to produce electricity. As opposed to mirrors, which redirect the sun, trackers use Fresnel lenses to concentrate sunlight inside the module to produce electricity, and therefore, they would not noticeably

October 2015 7345

I95-18

affect the temperature of the surrounding area; temperatures below the modules would be nearly the same as ambient temperatures in ordinary shade. Ultimately, although the panels do create heat due to dissipation of the heat in the solar modules, the panels also create shade. The heat generated from the solar panels is natural; without the presence of the solar panels the heat would still be present, but less localized, and all the solar irradiance would be dissipated into heat in the environment. Therefore, the panels are not anticipated to cause a rise in temperatures at the site above what would otherwise occur without the Proposed Project, or produce a heat island effect.

The County acknowledges the comment regarding the "Imperial Valley projects", which does not raise an environmental issue relative to the DPEIR.

This comment expresses the commenter's opposition to the Project. Under CEQA, social and economic effects need not be considered in the DPEIR (14 CCR 15064(e)); therefore, the applicant's financial solvency is not addressed in the DPEIR and no further response is required. DPEIR Section 1.2.1.1 describes the decommissioning obligations, including a removal surety, for the Proposed Project. Ultimately, the Board of Supervisors must determine whether to approve the Project or any alternatives. The information in this

I95-20 Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife! brawley, CA 92227 Feb 12, 2014 christina kaylor santee, CA 92071 Feb 12, 2014 Laura Woodworth-Gibson Oceanside, CA 92054 Feb 12, 2014 Please STOP destroying our open spaces and beautiful east county. E do not have enough water for these projects, they lower property values. I will be oraganizing people t drop off the grid so they will be able to 195-20 withhold money from these energy oligarchs. Mike Walker Santee, CA 92071 Feb 12, 2014 Celeste Wilson Boulevard CA 91905 Feb 12, 2014 Helen Yuhl Descanso, CA 91916-0374 Feb 12, 2014 Pamela Sokol Lemon Grove, CA 91945 Feb 12, 2014 William M Crane San Diego, CA 92122 Feb 12, 2014 Peter G. Bradley Descanso, CA 91916 Feb 12, 2014 Val DeWitt JAMUL, CA 91935 Feb 12, 2014 Van Aggson La Mesa, CA 91941 Feb 12, 2014 MoveOn.org

letter will be in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the County Decision makers.

acknowledges The County the commenter's opposition to the Project. The information in this comment will be in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the Decision makers.

Potential impacts related to groundwater use were considered and addressed in the DPEIR; see Sections 3.1.5.3.4, Groundwater Resources and 3.1.9.3.1, Water. As stated in Section 3.1.9.3.1, the County will place conditions on the Major Use Permit that will restrict the amount of water that is permitted to be withdrawn from the on-site wells in order to prevent interference with off-site wells. As such, the County does not anticipate that wells of neighboring residents will run dry as a result of the Proposed Project. Please also refer to common response WR1 and WR2.

This comment also raises concerns regarding property values. This topic was not evaluated in the DPEIR since it is not related to environmental impacts (see 14 CCR 15131). However, this type of information will be presented to decision makers for their consideration during the hearing process for the Proposed Project.

October 2015 7345

Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife! Tina Castle El Cajon, CA 92021 Feb 12, 2014 Julie salmons descanso, CA 91916 Feb 12, 2014 These types of projects will have major harm in communities that are dependent on groundwater. Please vote no. Sharon Penny Descanso, CA 91916 Feb 12, 2014 Sarah Schlegel San Diego, CA 92117 Feb 11, 2014 Julian molloy san mateo, CA 94403 Feb 11, 2014 Victoria L Brooks La Mesa, CA 91942 Feb 11, 2014 brian collins Encinitas, CA 92023 Feb 11, 2014 James. Webster San Diego, CA 92115 Feb 11, 2014 Janet Backer San Diego, CA 92109 Feb 11, 2014 Colleen Moore San Diego, CA 92104 Feb 11, 2014	[I95-21	195-21	The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The information in this comment will be in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the Decision makers. Refer to response to comment I95-20 above regarding potential impacts to groundwater resources.
Edward Gildred Palm Springs, CA 92262-4845 Feb 11, 2014 MoveOn.org 7			

	Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife!		
	Linda McCoy Campo, CA 91906 Feb 11, 2014	_	
There ar	c better places to do this project		-2
	Daniel Page Spring Valley, CA 91977 Feb 11, 2014		
goes alo	r water resources are at such a premium this is not a viable option along with the extra fire danger th ag with such a project. This in no way shape or form is "Green" and in fact only reduces our wild li angers the entire area. Scot Link 858-692-6963	fe I95	-2
1	Scot Link San Diego, CA 92117 Feb 11, 2014		
1	lustin Mank Manhattan Beach, CA 90266 Feb 11, 2014	_	
	łavid Bardwick sscondido, CA 92029 Feb 11, 2014	_	
THIS IS	CRAZY, Please vote NO!	195	-2
3	Debi Pellkofer Valley Center, CA 92082 Feb 10, 2014	•	
away fro & parkin	on't let this be a legacy of shame for our San Diego County supervisors. I bought land here to to be m industrialization. If the amount of money spent on this grant alone was spent to promote roof top go lot solar in areas where electricity is consumed it would be a grand gesture indeed. This project inst the community plan.	195	-2
1	John Smith Boulevard, CA 91905 Feb 10, 2014		
5	fina link San Diego, CA 92117 Feb 10, 2014	_	
NO PRO	JECT	- 195	-2
(Carolyn Loudermilk	1	
	MoveOn.org	8	

- The County acknowledges the commenter's preference for an alternative location for the Proposed Project. Please refer to common response ALT1 and response to comment I95-14 regarding the County's analysis of alternative locations. This comment does not raise specific issues related to the Project or adequacy of the environmental analysis in the DPEIR; therefore, no additional response is provided or required.
- Refer to response to comment I95-20 above regarding potential impacts to groundwater resources. In addition, please refer to response to comment I95-17 regarding the potential fire risk associated with the Proposed Project. The DPEIR analyzes and considers impacts to wildlife in Section 2.3, Biological Resources. With the implementation of mitigation, the County found that the Project would have a less than significant impact on wildlife.

The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The information in this comment will be in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the Decision makers.

The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The information in this comment will be in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the Decision makers.

I95-25 County acknowledges The the commenter's opposition to the Project. As stated in Chapter 1.0, Project Description, of the DPEIR, each project would require a Major Use Permit and each application for a major use permit will be evaluated for neighborhood compatibility, General Plan consistency, and environmental impacts. The DPEIR assesses the Proposed Project's conformance with the General Plan and Boulevard Community Plan (County of San Diego 2010, 2013; see Section 2.5.3.2 and Appendices 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 of the DPEIR). Ultimately, the decision makers must determine whether the Proposed Project complies with the intent of the General Plan and Boulevard Community Plan. The information in this comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.

195-26 The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project; the comment does not raise an environmental issue relative to the DPEIR for which a further response is required.

comment I95-20 regarding water resources.
nis comment, which does not
relative to the DPEIR.
ì

October 2015 7345 I95-19

Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife!		I95-29	The County acknowledges this comment, which does not
Anna Adams Woodland Hills, CA 91367 Feb 10, 2014			raise an environmental issue relative to the DPEIR.
Herman Presson Santa Ysabel, CA 92070 Feb 10, 2014			
Lynda Endicott Poway, CA 92064 Feb 10, 2014			
Carla Stamos San Marcos, CA 92069 Feb 10, 2014			
Emerson Palame Oak Grove, GA 30101 Feb 10, 2014			
Michael Moran Boulevard, CA 91905 Feb 10, 2014			
Mary Anne Oppenheimer Boulevard, CA 91905 Feb 10, 2014			
amanda adams LA JOLLA, CA 92038 Feb 10, 2014			
My husband and I own property in Boulevard and are planning to return to Boulevard when we retire. We are hoping that Boulevard can keep it rural beauty.	I 195-29		
Nancy Walker Cartisle, PA 17013 Feb 10, 2014	-		
MARC A PEEKS Santee, CA 92071 Feb 10, 2014			
remus anders Haupt encinitas, CA 92024 Feb 10, 2014			
MoveOn.org 10			

October 2015 7345 195-20

Final PEIR

	Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife!
	John Schneider
	Fininis, CA 92024 Feb 10, 2014
5.6	
	Aaron Peterson Boulevard, CA 91905 Feb 10, 2014
	Jared
	San Francisco, CA 94130 Feb 10, 2014
	massimo Sasso poway, CA 92064 Feb 10, 2014
	Barbara Takashima Encinitas, CA 92024 Feb 10, 2014
	reed HABERER san diego, CA 92117 Feb 10, 2014
	Jeffrey A. Byrd Boulevard, CA 91905 Feb 10, 2014
	Patrick
	Poway, CA 92064 Feb 10, 2014
	James Endicott Poway, CA 92064 Feb 10, 2014
	100 10, 2017
	MoveOn.org

Save	e San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildli	fe!	
that are dependent upon our water and visitors to our back country wi to place an immediate halt and mor	roject, will mean an ecological disaster to wells to sustain our health, homes and plan ill be seriously impacted. I strongly urge th attorium until further comprehensive object action to place an injunction and halt to the iorated expeditiously.	at crops. My family, neighbors e San Diego County Supervisors tive environmental impact] 195-3
Henry B. Lopez Pine Valley, CA 91962 Feb 9, 2014			.1
Mary and Frank Morgan Santa Ysabel, CA 92070 Feb 9, 2014		2	
Please plan very carefully to save of judith gezon Carlsbad, CA 92008 Feb 9, 2014	rur most important wild areas and aquifers	1] I95-
	reserve what little water resources exist. We from businesses who wish to plunder nat ls, and natural plants.		195-3
Barbara Huntington Chula Vista, CA 91913 Feb 9, 2014		·	
Martha Schaffner San Diego, CA 92113 Feb 9, 2014			
	MoveOn.org	12	

Please refer to response to comment I95-20 regarding potential impacts to groundwater resources. In addition, potential impacts related to groundwater-dependent habitat were considered and addressed in the DPEIR; see Section 2.3.3.2 Riparian Habitat or Sensitive Natural Community.

I95-31 In conformance with CEQA, the DPEIR evaluated the whole of the action and analyzed each environmental subject area with regard to potential adverse effects, as well as a reasonable range of alternatives. The DPEIR is consistent with the County's EIR Format and General Content Requirements, dated September 26, 2006. Each section of the DPEIR lists references used in the preparation of that section, including the studies used to support the analysis and conclusions presented in the DPEIR. The referenced sections provide all studies used as reference and background material within the analysis of each applicable section of the DPEIR. All important data or material was incorporated directly into the analysis of the DPEIR. The DPEIR includes summarized technical data pursuant to Section 15147 of the CEQA Guidelines, and provides sufficient material "to permit full assessment of significant environmental impacts by reviewing agencies and members of the public." Any reports associated with technical analysis were made available for public review.

Please refer to response to comment I95-20 regarding potential impacts to groundwater resources. The information in this comment will be provided in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the County Decision makers.

Please refer to response to comment I95-20 regarding potential impacts to groundwater resources. The County analyzed impacts to biological resources in DPEIR Chapter 2.3, Biological Resources and found that the Project would have a less than significant impact on plant and wildlife species with the implementation of mitigation. The information in this comment will be provided in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.

Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife! There are many reasons for voting no on this project. One of the biggest concerns is the tremendous waste of water. In a time of severe drought this project is scheduled to use thousands of gallons of water and that is just in the constructionthe use of water to keep these huge panels clean is mind boggling. Our governor is calling for water conservation now, yet is pushing for the completion of this project makes one wonder if he has any idea of what is going on. Other thing is the destruction of the vegetation around these panel which affects the wildlife plus the eyesore they are - destroying our lovely rural countryside is reprehensible. Pleaase vot NO and save our backcountry! Myra Price Jacumba, CA 91934 Feb 9, 2014 The environment of San Diego County and nearby Ocotillo in Imperial County has been irreparably harmed by supposedly "green" energy projects pushed though by multinational corporations who suck up our tax dollars and destroy everything in their path. Rushing yet another environment killing project through is irresponsible. Let's go with distributed solar! Put power generation where it's used instead of building these ghastly and dangerous transmission lines. Please begin to consider protecting what little is left of our beautiful back country, our water, our wildlife. Mary Hicklin Lakeside, CA 92040 Feb 9, 2014 Save our wildlife! Karen goldman Round Mountain. CA 96084 Feb 9, 2014 Laraine Turk Joshua Tree, CA 92252 Feb 9, 2014 Kaimi Lockwood	☐ 195-34 ☐ 195-35 ☐ 195-36 ☐ 195-37	195-34 195-35	Please refer to response to comment I95-20 regarding potential impacts to groundwater resources. Potential impacts related to biological resources were considered and addressed in the DPEIR; see Section 2.3, Biological Resources. The County found that the Project would have a less than significant impact on vegetation and habitat with the implementation of proposed mitigation. The County acknowledges that the Project will have significant and unavoidable impacts related to the existing visual character of the site and surroundings. These issues are discussed in Chapter 2.1, Aesthetics, of the DPEIR. The County disagrees with the commenter's assertion that it is "rushing through" the Proposed Project. The
Feb 9, 2014 please stop this project cal meier lakeside, CA 92040 Peb 8, 2014 steve turigliatto MoveOn.org 13	I 195-39	195-37 195-38	application for the Proposed Project has been processed by the County according to the County Zoning Ordinance and related regulations. This comment does not otherwise raise an environmental issue for which a response is required. The information in this comment will be provided in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision makers. Please refer to Common Response ALT2 regarding the commenter's preference for distributed generation energy projects. The County acknowledges the commenter's concern regarding wildlife. Potential impacts to wildlife were

		195-39	considered and addressed in DPEIR Chapter 2.3, Biological Resources. The DPEIR found that the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on wildlife with the implementation of proposed mitigation. The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The comment will be in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.
Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife! escondido, CA 92026 Feb 8, 2014 If SDG&E and its parent company weren't private, profit making organizations we wouldn't have to support CEO compensation of over eleven million dollars and could afford rooftop solar throughout the county. Kiki Munchi Julian, CA 92036 Feb 8, 2014 The square footage of the 30' tall Soitec panel space density for the 4 Soitec projects planned in Boulevard = 48 Walmant Supercenters that average 185,000 square feet each. Energy should be generated where it is consumed—not by industrializing groundwater dependent trust communities in identified wildfire corridors. Each project represents a new fire ignition source. These projects are not about green energy. They are a money grab-469M for 2 of the 4 projects @ 30% Investment Tax Credit. Soitec is having problems at their 1.5 MW Newberry Soalr 1 site so how can they build 168MW in Boulevard—without the same operation and maintenance problems? Donna Tisdale Boulevard, CA 91905 Feb 8, 2014 Tom Ingalls Julian, CA 92036 Feb 8, 2014 Barbara H. George Los Soss, CA 93402 Feb 8, 2014 Barbara Emson Valley Center, CA 92082 Feb 8, 2014 Darrell Walker Ocotillo, CA 92259 Feb 8, 2014	I 195-40 I 195-41 I 195-42 I 195-43 I 195-44	I95-40 I95-41 I95-42	The County acknowledges the comment regarding SDG&E, which does not raise an environmental issue relative to the DPEIR. Please refer to Common Response ALT2 regarding the commenter's preference for distributed generation energy projects. The County acknowledges the comment regarding big-box development, which does not raise an environmental issue relative to the DPEIR. Please refer to Common Response ALT2 regarding the commenter's preference for distributed generation energy projects. The County generally agrees that the Proposed Project would introduce possible ignition sources. Please refer to response to comment I95-17 for additional information.
MoveOn.org 14			

October 2015 7345 195-25 I95-43 The County acknowledges the comment regarding Project costs, which does not raise an environmental issue relative to the DPEIR.

The comment regarding the Newberry Solar 1 site is acknowledged and will be included in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not raise an environmental issue specific to the DPEIR for which a response is required.

The County acknowledges this comment, which does not raise an environmental issue relative to the DPEIR.

Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife!		195-45	Please refer to response to comment I95-20
How can these projects even be considered during this drought, or any time? The groundwater is not endless as these contractors think. What do they care? Get in get paid and get out, that's all they care about. They don't live there. Short term gain, with no thought about the long term.	I 195-45		regarding potential impacts to groundwater resources. The remainder of the comment does not
Dennis Wilson San Diego, CA 91905 Feb 8, 2014			raise an environmental issue for which further
We need to incentivize rooftop solar development and local distributed generation and not destroy the wild beauty and character of our backcountry.	I 195-46		response is required.
Terry Weiner San Diego, CA 92103 Feb 8, 2014		195-46	Please refer to Common Response ALT2 regarding
Linda Shannon Boulevard, CA 91905 Fe 08, 2014		155 40	the commenter's preference for distributed generation
Anthony Backer Corvallis, MT 59828 Feb 8, 2014			energy projects. The remainder of the comment does
"NO PROJECT" is the only logical and correct vote for this proposal. There are many more such projects to come, hopefully they will be better planned with less negative impacts to our area.	I 195-47		not raise a specific environmental issue related to the Proposed Project or the adequacy of the DPEIR for
Eldon R. Caldwell Jacumba Hot Springs, CA 91934 Feb 8, 2014			which further response can be provided.
Patricia Landis Julian, CA 92036 Feb 8, 2014			
Joyce Adams Carisbad, CA 92009 Feb 8, 2014		195-47	The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The information in this
Schuyler Jung Encinitas, CA 92024 Feb 8, 2014			comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review
solar is wonderful but not at the expense of wildlife - be it animals, birds or trees. Put these ugly panels on top of buildings in parking lots - just do not ruin our beautiful natural habitats	I 195-48		and consideration by the Board of Supervisors.
Barbara Nigro julian, CA 92036 Feb 8, 2014		195-48	Please refer to Common Response ALT2 regarding the
MoveOn.org 15		150 40	commenter's preference for distributed generation
			energy projects. Regarding the commenter's concern
			related to impacts to animals, birds, and trees, potential
			impacts to wildlife and habitat were considered and
			addressed in DPEIR Chapter 2.3, Biological Resources. The County found that the Proposed Project would have
			a less than significant impact on wildlife and habitat with
			the implementation of proposed mitigation.
			The County acknowledges the commenter's
			opposition to the Project. The information in this

October 2015 7345 195-27

Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife! Harry Backer San Diego, CA 92110 Feb 8, 2014	_		comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.
Members of the SD County Board of Supervisors please don't let this be your legacy. That on your watch you ignored the will of your constituents and allowed the destruction of a beautiful natural resource. Tracy Backer SanDiego, CA 92110 Feb 8, 2014] 195- 4 9	195-49	The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The information in this
This project is wrong!!! Martha G Williams Brawley, CA 92227 Feb 8, 2014	I 195-50		comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.
Deborah Cornsweet Encinitas, CA 92024 Feb 8, 2014 James Comeau Station Valley CA 01020		195-50	The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The comment will be
Spring Valley, CA 91979 Feb 7, 2014 Go close to the border Valerie kearney Boulevard, CA 91909 Feb 7, 2014	I 195-51		provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.
Valetta Witherell San Diego, CA 92110 Feb 7, 2014		195-51	One of the proposed solar farm sites, Tierra del
Water is the main issue with me. My understanding is that Boulevard is already concerned about water resources. 100% of all Water should be railed in from the Salton Sea. Duane Zugel Jacumba Warm Springs, CA 91934 Feb 7, 2014 Mike Pangle Boulevard, CA 91905 Feb 7, 2014] 195-52		Sol, is adjacent to the U.SMexico border; this comment lacks sufficient detail to provide a more thorough response.
Nancy Carroll Mariposa, CA 95338 MoveOn.org 16		195-52	Please refer to response to comment I95-20 regarding potential impacts to groundwater resources. Water sources to be used during construction of the Proposed Project are discussed in Section 3.1.5.1.1, Regional Overview.

October 2015 7345

Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife! Feb 7, 2014 Gary Charles Bouleward, CA 91905 Feb 7, 2014 carrie frazer dresden, TN 38225 Feb 7, 2014 Joanne Homer Spring Valley, CA 91978 Feb 7, 2014 Shannon Harris El Cajon, CA 93921 Feb 7, 2014 This is a very important issue for all county residents. Dennis Berglund Pinc Valley, CA 91962 Feb 7, 2014 David Jamen Campo, CA 91906 Feb 6, 2014 Jared Fuller Plesaant Grove, UT 84062 Feb 6, 2014 Elizabeth Bulkley Elscondido, CA 92026 Feb 6, 2014 Kanida Alvemza ALPNE, CA 91901 Feb 6, 2014 Davielle Prazer Semmes, AL 36575 Feb 6, 2014 Peter Shapiro Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067 Feb 6, 2014	I 195-53	195-53	The comment does not raise an environmental issue for which a response is required. The information in this comment will be in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the Board of Supervisors.
MoveOn.org 17			

Sun Sun Nien County's Amilian and Wildlifed		195-54	Please refer to response to comment I95-20 regarding potential impacts to groundwater resources.
Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife! This project will impact my home that I and my parents have worked to build for 14 years. We have already experienced water draw down and sanding in our wells from other projects in the area. This would draw down our water further especially in this time of drought. Most people can't afford foaroud \$100, buolular have to re-tap their well because of an industrial project using the water. We chose to live hear and drive far to work because of the natural environment in provides our family (raising animals, no pollution or light, small town atmosphere, etc) and this is a residential area. It feels swful (like a real personal violation) that someone with big money can just come up here and change our General Plan to suite their needs knowing that as small town people don't have the money to fight it. We elect people, honorable people to do the right thing for us, protect us from big money. Their has to be another way to go green other than ruining benopes lives. When is it Ox to ruin peoples lives!. When you don't know them, when their aren't that many in a certain area, when they are open, when they are open oven the projects us our freedoms By the way on other projects what is right and honorable, what you were voted into office for and what my son, my father and grandlather fought to protect as our freedoms By the way on other projects what is Ox to get a take permit for a protected brid like our eagles. I just don't know where it stops, please help it to stop, their has to be another way. Sincerely, A Concerned American Citizen, Voter and Resident of Boulevard, Audra Burgio Boulevard, CA 91905 Feb 6, 2014 We are not building self-sustaining urban centers when we destroy wild and scenic, rural and agricultural lands to power them. Linda Michael	195-54 195-55 195-56	195-55	The County does not agree with the assertion that the General Plan is proposed to be changed to suit the needs of the Proposed Project. The commenter is referred to the response to comment I95-25. The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The information in this comment will be provided in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.
John Blair El Cajon, CA 92019 Feb 5, 2014 Danny Lenz Alpine, CA 91901 Feb 5, 2014 Put them in La Jollat Craig Williams Campo, CA 91906 Feb 5, 2014 Linda Espino San Diego, CA 92101 Feb 5, 2014 MoveOn.org 18	<u> I</u> 195-58	195-56	This comment does not raise specific issues related to the Project or adequacy of the environmental analysis in the DPEIR; therefore, no additional response is provided or required. While the comment regarding take permits for protected birds refers to "other projects", the incidental take permit process associated with federally listed endangered species is described in Chapter 2.3, Biological Resources, of the DPEIR (see pages 2.3-84 to 2.3-85).
		195-57	The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The comment does not raise a specific environmental issue related to the Proposed Project or the adequacy of the DPEIR for which further response can be provided. The information in this comment will be provided in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.

October 2015

Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife! It is unthinkable that they could devastate our community's and wildlife like this just for a profit. Michele Wilkins Jacumba, CA 91934 Feb 5, 2014 Kathy Urich La Mesa, CA 91942 Feb 5, 2014] 195-59	195-58	The County acknowledges the commenter's preference for an alternative location for the Project. Please refer to common response ALT1 regarding the County's analysis of alternative locations.
These areas are residential areas. Why can't the industrial projects go where no one lives? The people who lease the land and do not live here want the money Please leave this residential area alone. East of here in the necksmaybe. Put stolar panels on all the buildings, houses, and parking lots of San Diego. Doesn't that make more sense? Mary Lu Brandwein Mary Lu Brandwein Boulevard, CA 91905 Feb 5, 2014 Lets do all the Gov. building roof tops, Private home roofs, parking lots, etc., Before using up/closing off our open and recreational spaces. Gary L. Clark Julian, CA 92036 Feb 4, 2014 save my well. Larry Monday Boulevard, CA 91905 Feb 4, 2014 Mathew Kelley Boulevard, CA 91905 Feb 4, 2014 Branden ParishBr San Diego, CA 92116 Feb 4, 2014 Priscilla Monday Boulevard, CA 91905 Feb 4, 2014 Priscilla Monday Boulevard, CA 91905 Feb 4, 2014 MoveOn.org 19	[195-60] [195-61] [195-62]	195-59	The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. Regarding the commenter's concern related to impacts to wildlife, potential impacts to wildlife were considered and addressed in DPEIR Chapter 2.3, Biological Resources. The DPEIR found that the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on wildlife with the implementation of proposed mitigation. This comment does not raise specific issues related to the adequacy of the environmental analysis in the DPEIR for which additional response can be provided. Please refer to response to comment I95-25 regarding the DPEIR and conclusions regarding the Proposed Projects' consistency with the land use designation and zoning of the sites. Please refer to Common Responses ALT1 and ALT2 regarding the commenter's preference for alternative locations for the Proposed Project and distributed generation energy projects.
		195-61	Please refer to Common Response ALT2 regarding the commenter's preference for distributed generation energy projects.

October 2015

7345

Final PEIR

Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife! I am extremely concerned that the water useage of the Soitec solar project scheduled for the San Diego county outback area will jeopardize out daily supply of household water or possible eliminate it all together. Our area has no public water system and therefore depends entirely on wells which are supplied by the aquiffers in this area. If you allow the project to do as planned and estimated (which is grossly under estimated in the projected use of the water) we could be ruined. We are business people here in this community and make our living and provide jobs for many in the area. Without this water we will all go broke. It is very apparent that the county back is grossly overlooked by the county. Please protect our natural resources and help eliminate this gross overuse of our water. Helen Landman Jacumba, CA 91934	195-63	I95-62	Please refer to response to comment I95-20 regarding potential impacts to groundwater resources. The comment lacks sufficient detail to which a more thorough response can be provided. Please refer to response to response to comment I95-20
Feb 4, 2014 Rooftop Solar, how many times must one repeat that? There are ample rooftops in the city! TM Santee, CA 92071	I 195-64	193-03	regarding potential impacts to groundwater resources.
Feb 4, 2014 David Ladmen Jacumba, CA 91934 Feb 4, 2014 teri Lederman boulsvard, CA 91905 Feb 4, 2014 Jim Bell Jim Diego, CA 92107 Feb 4, 2014 Linda V Woods Lakeside, CA 92040 Feb 4, 2014 Pautine EL CAJON, CA 92021 Feb 4, 2014 Pauca Guy Boulevard, CA 91905 Feb 4, 2014 Paula G Byrd Boulevard, CA 91905 Feb 4, 2014 MoveOn.org 20 MoveOn.org 20		195-64	Please refer to Common Response ALT2 regarding the commenter's preference for distributed generation energy projects.

October 2015 7345 195-32

Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife! Jeanne Nelson Boulevard, CA 91905 Feb 4, 2014 "No Project"! Michele Strand Boulevard, CA 91905	I 195-65	195-65	The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.
Feb 4, 2014 stanley keniston San Diego, CA 92116 Feb 4, 2014 I support rooftop solar, but we can't afford to put rural water aquifers at risk in the middle of a drought. Don Wood La Mesa, CA 91941 Feb 4, 2014 Jana Clark San Diego, CA 92102 Feb 4, 2014	I 195-66	195-66	Please refer to Common Response ALT2 regarding the commenter's preference for distributed generation energy projects. Please also refer to response to comment 195-20 regarding potential impacts to groundwater resources.
Duncan Descanso, CA 91916 Feb 4, 2014 All this and more! The industrialization of the backcountry is insane and we will regret it later when the full impacts are understood. By then it will be too late and this will be YOUR legacy as supervisors. Billie Jo Jannen Campo, CA 91906 Feb 4, 2014 Douglas Kenyon San Diego, CA 92111 Feb 4, 2014 Armando Gallardo Jacumba, CA 91934 Feb 4, 2014	195-67	195-67	The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The comment does not raise a specific environmental issue related to the Proposed Project or the adequacy of the DPEIR for which further response can be provided. The comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.
MoveOn.org 21			

Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife!		195-68	Social and economic effects need not be considered in
How can we not try to fight back. This project is in my back yard and it will greatly lessen the value of my land. I have lived here for 23 years hoping to leave some small part of nature to my son. So no to this project leave some thing for the next generation to enjoy.	I 195-68		an EIR. See CEQA Guidelines section 15064(e).
leslie mauris boulevard, CA 91905 Feb 4, 2014		I95-69	The County acknowledges the commenter's
Pennie Leachman Failbrook, CA 92028 Feb 4, 2014			opposition to the Project. The comment does not raise
Please don't use the beautiful back country AGAIN for high projects! Sandi Williams Campo, CA 91906	I 195-69		a specific environmental issue related to the Proposed Project or the adequacy of the DPEIR for which
Feb 4, 2014 This affects Jacumba as well! Please stop this madness.	T 195-70		further response can be provided. The information in
Fredericka Carlile Jacumba, CA 91934 Feb 4, 2014	•		this comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.
Diane Lewis San Diego, CA 92111 Feb 4, 2014			review and consideration by the decision makers.
larry gale el cajon, CA 92019 Feb 4, 2014		I95-70	The County acknowledges the commenter's
Trevor Doughery campo, CA 91906 Feb 4, 2014			opposition to the Project. The comment does not raise a specific environmental issue related to the Proposed
I live in Ocotillo, the Ocotillo Wind project has destroyed my way of living and our community. Please Stop this madness	I 195-71		Project or the adequacy of the DPEIR for which
Jim Pelley Ocoillo, CA 92259 Feb 4, 2014			further response can be provided. The information in
Susan Moore Valley Centor, CA 92082 Feb 4, 2014			this comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.
MoveOn.org 22		195-71	The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The commenter's opinion on
			the Ocotillo Wind project does not raise an environmental issue related to the Proposed Project or
		-	the DPEIR; therefore, no further response is provided.
			The information in this comment will be provided in
			the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.

October 2015 7345 195-34

Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife Terrin Downey Ironwood, MI 49938 Feb 4, 2014 Edward (Pat) Maher San Diego, CA 92126 Feb 3, 2014 Norma J. Larsen Jacumba, CA 91934 Feb 3, 2014 Dustin Delgado Santa Ysabel, CA 92070 Feb 3, 2014 Richard Hoverstock San Diego, CA 92124 I spend a portion of every year visiting this precious area because it is the last vestige of the coastal chaparral ecosystem in southern California. The value of tourism, the value of the vulnerable species in the area require thorough consideration and a the greatest caution and protection. Please do the right thing and really think it 195-72 through. mike shepherd Vashon, WA 98070 Feb 3, 2014 My husband and I own property in boulevard and have seen one thing after another threaten the environment and rural beauty. Please stop using this area as a dumping ground for projects no one wants and does not 195-73 Santa ysabel, CA 92070 Feb 3, 2014 Susan Martin Ramona, CA 92065 Feb 3, 2014 jessie shepherd campo, CA 91906 Feb 3, 2014 MoveOn.org

I95-72

This comment raises concerns regarding the value of tourism. This topic was not evaluated in the DPEIR since it is not related to environmental impacts. See CEQA Guidelines section 15131. However, this information in this comment letter will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.

Potential impacts to wildlife species were considered and addressed in the DPEIR. Please see Chapter 2.3, Biological Resources. The DPEIR found that the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on sensitive wildlife and plant species with the implementation of proposed mitigation.

In conformance with CEQA, the DPEIR evaluated the whole of the action and analyzed each environmental subject area with regard to potential adverse effects, as well as a reasonable range of alternatives. The DPEIR is consistent with the County's EIR Format and General Content Requirements, dated September 26, 2006.

I95-73

The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The comment does not raise a specific environmental issue related to the Proposed Project or the adequacy of the DPEIR for which further response can be provided. The information in this comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.

October 2015

7345

Final PEIR

I do not want them in our areas they take to much water and are to noisy and do not produce what they promise Brenda Jarrett Ramona, CA 92065 Feb 3, 2014 Travis spencer jacumba, CA 91934 Feb 3, 2014 melinda dart jacumba, CA 91934 Feb 3, 2014 Laura Cyphert Lakeside, CA 92040 Feb 3, 2014 The EIR system is in place to protect the valuable resources that are quickly being parsed away due to development and "projects." To have "fast tracked" the process is an admission of collusion with the project itself and is tossing the back country under the bus again. Solar projects can easily be added into the infrastructure of the city it is meant to serve. Utilize what already exists. DO NOT put this project in the back country! Jan Hedlun Potrero, CA 91963 Feb 3, 2014 Gary Garrison Jacumba, CA 91934	
Ramona, CA 92065 Feb 3, 2014 Travis spencer jacumba, CA 91934 Feb 3, 2014 melinda dart jacumba, CA 91934 Feb 3, 2014 Laura Cyphert Lakeside, CA 92040 Feb 3, 2014 The EIR system is in place to protect the valuable resources that are quickly being parsed away due to development and "projects." To have "fast tracked" the process is an admission of collusion with the project itself and is tossing the back country under the bus again. Solar projects can easily be added into the infrastructure of the city it is meant to serve. Utilize what already exists. DO NOT put this project in the back country! Jan Hedlun Potrero, CA 91963 Feb 3, 2014 Gary Garrison Jacumba, CA 91934	
jacumba, CA 91934 Feb 3, 2014 melinda dart jacumba, CA 91934 Feb 3, 2014 Laura Cyphert Lakeside, CA 92040 Feb 3, 2014 The EIR system is in place to protect the valuable resources that are quickly being parsed away due to development and "projects." To have "fast tracked" the process is an admission of collusion with the project itself and is tossing the back country under the bus again. Solar projects can easily be added into the infrastructure of the city it is meant to serve. Utilize what already exists. DO NOT put this project in the back country! Jan Hedlun Potrero, CA 91963 Feb 3, 2014 Gary Garrison Jacumba, CA 91934	
jacumba, CA 91934 Feb 3, 2014 Laura Cyphert Lakeside, CA 92040 Feb 3, 2014 The EIR system is in place to protect the valuable resources that are quickly being parsed away due to development and "projects." To have "fast tracked" the process is an admission of collusion with the project itself and it tossing the back country under the bus again. Solar projects can easily be added into the infrastructure of the city it is meant to serve. Utilize what already exists. DO NOT put this project in the back country! Jan Hedlun Potrero, CA 91963 Feb 3, 2014 Gary Garrison Jacumba, CA 91934	
Lakesido, CA 92040 Feb 3, 2014 The IIR system is in place to protect the valuable resources that are quickly being parsed away due to development and 'projects.' To have 'fast tracked' the process is an admission of collusion with the project iself and is tossing the back country under the bus again. Solar projects can easily be added into the infrastructure of the city it is meant to serve. Utilize what already exists. DO NOT put this project in the back country! Jan Hedlun Potrero, CA 91963 Feb 3, 2014 Gary Garrison Jacumba, CA 91934	
development and "projects." To have "fast tracked" the process is an admission of collusion with the project itself and is tossing the back country under the bus again. Solar projects can easily be added into the infrastructure of the city it is meant to serve. Utilize what already exists, DO NOT put this project in the back country! Jan Hedlun Potrero, CA 91963 Feb 3, 2014 Gary Garrison Jacumba, CA 91934	
Potrero, CA 91963 Feb 3, 2014 Gary Garrison Jacumba, CA 91934	
Jacumba, CA 91934	
Feb 3, 2014	
My main objection to the project is that it would needlessly waste the most precious resource we have on the planet, which is water. Permanently drain our aquifers for THIS? Is anybody thinking? Instead of calling this a "solar power project," it should much more aptly be named an "Environmental Destruction Project. "The more anyone learns about this project, the clearer that is. Signed, Professor Scott Simpson, Imperial Valley College	
Scott Simpson Jacumba Hot Springs, CA 91934 Feb 3, 2014	
katrina spirz CAMPO, CA 91906 Feb 3, 2014	195-75
MoveOn.org 24	

I95-74 The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The information in this comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.

Environmental issues raised in this comment were considered and addressed in the DPEIR. See Chapter 3.1.5, Hydrology and Water Quality and Chapter 2.6, Noise. The DPEIR found that the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on water resources and a less than significant impact related to noise with the implementation of mitigation. The remainder of the comment does not raise an environmental issue related to the Project or the DPEIR; therefore, no further response is provided.

In conformance with CEQA, the DPEIR evaluated the whole of the action and analyzed each environmental subject area with regard to potential adverse effects, as well as a reasonable range of alternatives. The DPEIR is consistent with the County's EIR Format and General Content Requirements, dated September 26, 2006. Please refer to the response to comment 195-31.

The County disagrees with the commenter's assertion that it has allowed the "fast tracking" of the Proposed Project. The application for the Proposed Project has been processed by the County according to the County Zoning Ordinance and related regulations.

		195-76	This comment does not raise an environmental issue for which a response is required. The information in this comment will be provided in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.
		195-77	Please refer to response to comment I95-20 regarding potential impacts to groundwater resources.
NO Nels Christensen Alpine, CA 91901 Feb 3, 2014 Leslie Reburd Alpine, CA 91901 Feb 3, 2014 Robert Jarrett Ramona, CA 92065 Feb 3, 2014 Kim Lenahan Jacumba, CA 91934 Feb 3, 2014 Kristine C. Alessio La Mesa, CA 91941 Feb 3, 2014 Tabetha A Healy Alpine, CA 91901 Feb 3, 2014 Trish Gabourel Ironwood, MI 49938 Feb 3, 2014 Linda Ridge Jacumba, CA 91934 Feb 3, 2014 Linda Ridge Jacumba, CA 91934 Feb 3, 2014 Mary E Pangle	∏ 195-78	195-78 195-79	The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. This comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers. The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The information in this comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not raise a specific environmental issue related to the Proposed Project or the adequacy of the DPEIR for which further response can be provided.
Boulevard, CA 91905 Feb 3, 2014 Destroying the land and homes of the people in Easy County is immoral. Find another way. Neacy Boulevard, CA 91905 Feb 3, 2014 Suzanne Ward Pauma Valley, CA 92061 Feb 3, 2014 MoveOn.org 25	∏ 195-79		

October 2015 7345 195-37

Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife! Bonnie Hafdell Jacumba, CA, 91934 Feb 3, 2014 Newberry Solar I LLC (SOITEC's 2mw demo site) is my front yard. It is a rape of desert land and view. Solar should be for residential roofs, not pristine desert. Don't do it! Robert Berkman NEWBERRY SPRINGS, CA 92365 Feb 3, 2014 I am a sometime resident of San Diego and fear for water everywhere Elizabeth Welsh Tueson, AZ 85712 Feb 3, 2014 George W Majors SAN DIEGO, CA 92120 Feb 3, 2014	∏ 195-80 ∏ 195-81	195-80	The comment concerns the commenter's observations related to the Newberry Solar 1 solar farm, located in Newberry Springs, California, and does not raise specific issues related to the Project or adequacy of the environmental analysis in the DPEIR. Please refer to Common Response ALT2 regarding the commenter's preference for rooftop solar energy projects.
Shirley Mann San Diego, CA 92120 Feb 3, 2014 Jack Shn La Mesa, CA 91941 Feb 3, 2014 Yaney LA MacIver Corvallis, OR 97330 Feb 3, 2014 Sandias Tuttle La Mesa, CA 91941 Feb 3, 2014 Stop this Now!! Trisha McCann El Centro, CA 92243 Feb 3, 2014 Jennifer San Diego, CA 92119 Feb 3, 2014 MoveOn.org MoveOn.org 26	∐ 195-82	195-81 195-82	This comment does not raise specific issues related to the Project or adequacy of the environmental analysis in the DPEIR; please refer to response to comment I95-20 regarding potential impacts to water resources The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. This comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.

	Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife!		I95-83	The County acknowledges the commenter's
	Daniel Ferra Palm Springs, CA 92262 Feb 3, 2014	-		opposition to the Project. The information in thi
	Joseph P. Liles Santa Monica, CA 90405 Feb 3, 2014	-		comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.
	Rick LaZelle Descanso, CA 91916 Feb 3, 2014	_		and consideration by the decision makers.
	I know the area quite well, the proposed project is VERY GREEN, WITH THE GREEN OF BRIBERY DOLLARS! This supposed project MUST BE STOPPED AT ALL COSTS!	_ 		
	Aurea Walker Los Angeles, CA 90004 Feb 5, 2014	_		
	Mary Kennedy San Diego, CA 92117 Feb 3, 2014			
	Ron Batty PINE VALLEY, CA 91962 Feb 3, 2014			
	Harriet Markell Los Gatos, CA 95030 Feb 3, 2014			
	Sandy LeonVest Bolinas, CA 94924 Feb 3, 2014			
8	Bryan Butler campo, CA 91906 Feb 3, 2014	-		
	HOWARD G. SINGER LA JOLLA, CA 92038-0007 Feb 3, 2014	-		
	MoveOn.org 2	27		

Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife! Where is the million's of gallons water for this project suppose to come from. There's not enough ground water for this project You wants to see these ugly thing in a rural country area. Want about the traffic? Robert Smith Lakeside, CA 92040 Feb 3, 2014 Terry Hove Campo, CA 91906 Feb 3, 2014 stephen neimoyer Fresno, CA 93705 Feb 3, 2014 Please put the solar panels on a rooftop mike walker Santee, CA 92071	☐ 195-84 ☐ 195-85	195-84	Please refer to response to comment I95-20 regarding potential impacts to water resources including groundwater. Issues raised in this comment were considered and addressed in the DPEIR. The DPEIR analyzed potential impacts to aesthetics and traffic (DPEIR Chapter 2.1, Aesthetics and Chapter 3.1.8, Transportation and Traffic). The DPEIR found that the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact related to traffic. The County acknowledges
Feb 3, 2014 please push for rooftop alternatives and already disturbed places like roadsides when we use solar, but to take more water from an already exhausted drought ed wild place is conscienceless and extremely poor planning for our future. Also the damages happening from leaving empty holes in the earth are an increasing concern. thank you for your consideration i am against he use of more desert planning for Solar projects and Aquifer uses Deborah furley deborah hurley bonsall, CA 92003 Feb 3, 2014 Barb Halte	I 195-86 I 195-87	-0-0-	that the Project will have certain significant and unavoidable impacts related to scenic vistas and visual character and quality.
El Cajon, CA 92021 Feb 3, 2014 This foreign invasion will do damage far beyond San Diego County. Lewis McClellan Soulsbyville, CA 95372 Feb 3, 2014] I95-88	195-85	Please refer to Common Response ALT2 regarding the commenter's preference for distributed generation energy projects.
Debra Alpine, CA 91901-2016 Feb 3, 2014 This is eco terrorism at its worst Cheryl Furr MoveOn.org 28] 195-89	195-86	Please refer to Common Response ALT2 regarding the commenter's preference for distributed generation energy projects. Please also refer to response to comment I95-20 regarding potential impacts to groundwater resources.
		195-87	The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The information in this comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.
		195-88	The comment does not raise an environmental issue for which a response is required.

Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife!		195-89	The comment does not raise an environmental issue for which a response is required.
Lakeiside, CA 92040 Feb 3, 2014 Please Vote "No Project" Nancy McMahan Poway, CA 92064 Feb 3, 2014 tracy mcpherson imperial beach, CA 91932 Feb 3, 2014] 195-90	195-90	The County acknowledges the commenter's support of the No Project Alternative. The information in this comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.
Dennis S Twiss La Mesa, CA 91941 Feb 3, 2014 Please! No project!! We know there is pressure on all of you. Stand firm to save our backcountry. We care and are counting on you. Thank you! karen wahrenbrock el cajon, CA 92020 Feb 3, 2014 Janet Melander Gardnerville, NV 89460 Feb 3, 2014 Robson L. Splane Jr.] 195-91	195-91	The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The information in this comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.
Valley Center, CA 92982. Feb 3, 2014 The amount of water needed is a massive concern to me! Michael Warburton Boulevard, CA 91905	<u> </u> 195-92	195-92	Please also refer to response to comment I95-20 regarding potential impacts to water resources.
Feb 3, 2014 (NO PROJECT) TO THE PROPOSED EAST COUNTY Soiltee Solar Project Kurt Casdy PINE VALLEY, CA 91962 Feb 3, 2014 BryAnna Vaughan Big Pine, CA 93513 Feb 3, 2014 MoveOn.org 29	Ĭ 195-93	195-93	The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The information in this comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.

October 2015

7345

Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife! Eric Cope Campo, CA 91906 Feb 3, 2014 Please vote for "NO PROJECT"!!! Keep our Great Outdoors Great and our Open Spaces Open in our beautiful back country. Charles and Laurie Baker Santee, CA, CA 92071 Feb 3, 2014 Tom K. Lemon Grove, CA 91945 Feb 3, 2014	∏ 195-94	I95-94	The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The comment does not raise a specific environmental issue related to the Proposed Project or the adequacy of the DPEIR for which further response can be provided. The information in this comment will be provided in the FPEIR for
Dipika Kadaba Durham, NC 27701 Feb 3, 2014 Save Boulevard and other precious areas of East County Wilderness from this exploitative, government-funded eco-seam! Craig S. Maxwell La Mesa CA 91942] I95-95	195-95	review and consideration by the decision makers. The County acknowledges this comment. The comment does not raise a specific environmental issue
Feb 3, 2014 Carma Independence, CA 93526 Feb 3, 2014 What motive do the Supervisors have for this one???? Much better ways to go Green. Jan Shuttleworth Escondido, CA 92026	<u> </u> 195-96	105.04	related to the Proposed Project or the adequacy of the DPEIR for which further response can be provided.
Feb 3, 2014 This is the kind of stupidity that makes solar energy look bad. It was best designed for the point of use, on the roof. Say no to destructive solar energy, Say yes to rooftop. Kevin Emmerich Cima, CA 92323 Feb 3, 2014] I95-97	I95-96 I95-97	The County acknowledges this comment, which does not raise an environmental issue relative to the DPEIR. Please refer to Common Response ALT2 regarding
Dayna Dunbur Spring Valley, CA 91977 Feb 3, 2014 MoveOn.org 30			the commenter's preference for distributed generation energy projects.

October 2015 7345 195-42

Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife! sandra Boulevard, CA 91905 Feb 2, 2014 Linda Niman Alpine, CA 91901 Feb 2, 2014 Pamela Hoye San Diego, CA 92103 Feb 2, 2014 Eve Berashaw pauma valley, CA 92061 Feb 2, 2014 Article Brooke El Cajon, CA 92021 Feb 2, 2014 Marcella Tate Campo, CA 91906 Feb 2, 2014 Bill Pate El Cajon, CA 92020 Feb 2, 2014 In light of the published information on this project it most certainly illustrates the need for a change in our SD co. Supervisors that has obviously been overlooked for quite some time. "NO PROJECT" David Moon Jamul, CA 91935 Feb 2, 2014 Joseph Carmody Campo, CA 91906 Feb 2, 2014 olivia wilson campo, CA 91906 Feb 2, 2014 Monty Kroopkin San Diego, CA 92116 Feb 2, 2014	<u> </u> 195-98	195-98	The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The information in this comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.
MoveOn.org 31			

Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife!		195-99
Yvonne ryan Campo, CA 91906 Feb 2, 2014		
lorraine bloomfield escondido, CA 92027 Feb 2, 2014		
Stacy Nash Bruton Campo, CA 91906 Feb 2, 2014		I95-10 0
Our family has owned a small home in Jacumba since 1920. We escape the heat of the desert in Jacumba and hold our family reunions there. We value the rural, natural environment of the "back country", Please place solar panels on roof tops in the area where the power generated will be used. Don't sell our land and water to the greedy PLEASE!	195-99	
Lauryl Zinn Driscoll El Centro, CA 92243 Feb 2, 2014		
Doreen Ortmeier Potrero, CA 91963 Feb 2, 2014		
Karl Weiss San Diego, CA 92109 Feb 2, 2014		
In a time when Governor Brown is on nation news annoucing California is having one of the worst droughts, and begging the people to conserve all water at this time, you'd think someone in our local Government would stop this. But it seems the greater good for the people and the life giving waters at this time is over ruled by the greed of these Projects. I too say; "NO PROJECT" The loss of beautiful land scapes and wild life habitats will be forever lost, what a terrible waitst of water and land use! The loss of our wild birds is every where, there just not here any more due to the Wind Turbines. This is a crime against nature and all who live in it, including the people here who are trying to protect it. Governor Brown stop this or get off TV crying about water being respected by the people because down here it seems we have enough to one day wash millions of gallons on the thousands of solor pannels to keep the dust off them once a month? Stupid is has stupid does they say.	195-100	
and begging the people to conserve all water at this time, you'd think someone in our local Government would stop this. But it seems the greater good for the people and the life giving waters at this time is over ruled by the greed of these Projects. I too say; "NO PROJECT" The loss of beautiful land scapes and wild life habitats will be forever lost, what a terrible waist of water and land use! The loss of our wild brirds is every where, there just no there any more due to the Wind Turbines. This is a crime against nature and all who live in it, including the people here who are trying to protect it. Govenor Brown stop this or get off TV crying about water being respected by the people because down here it seems we have cought one and you what millions of gallons on the thousands of solor pannels to keep the dust off them once a month? Stupid is has stupid does	195-100	
and begging the people to conserve all water at this time, you'd think someone in our local Government would stop this. But it seems the greater good for the people and the life giving waters at this time is over ruled by the greed of these Projects. I too say; "NO PROJECT" The loss of beautiful land scapes and wild life habitats will be forever lost, what a terribe waits of water and land use! The loss of our wild brids is every where, there just not here any more due to the Wind Turbines. This is a crime against nature and all who live in it, including the people here who are trying to protect. If. Governe Brown stop this or get off TV crying about water being respected by the people because down here it seems we have enough to one day wash millions of gallons on the thousands of solor pannels to keep the dust off them once a month? Stupid is has stupid does they say. melody Ponchot Boulevard, CA 91905	195-100	

Please refer to Common Response ALT2 regarding the commenter's preference for distributed generation energy projects.

Issues raised in this comment were considered and

addressed in the DPEIR. Please see Chapter 3.1.5, Hydrology and Water Quality, Chapter 2.1, Aesthetics, and Chapter 2.3, Biological Resources. Please also refer to response to comment 195-20 regarding potential impacts to groundwater resources. Lastly, please refer to Section 1.2.1.1, Common Project Components and Activities, and common response WR1 and WR2 for construction and operational water demands of the Proposed Project. The DPEIR found that the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on water resources. The DPEIR also found that the Project would have a less than significant impact on biological resources, including wildlife, birds, and habitat, implementation of proposed mitigation. The County acknowledges that the Project would have a significant and unavoidable impact related to scenic vistas and visual character and quality.

October 2015 7345

	TOF 101	DI C . C D ALTO II
Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife! These projects run counter to their stated intent. WE need to put local roof top solar first. We have the	I95-101	Please refer to Common Response ALT2 regarding the commenter's preference for distributed generation
capacity to do this without destroying our back country for all of time, miles from where the energy is needed. Cynthia M. Buxton San Diego, CA 91932 Feb 2, 2014	193-101	energy projects.
janelle small campo, CA 91906 Feb 2, 2014	195-102	Please refer to Common Response ALT1 regarding
Alicelynn Cockrill Escondido, CA 92026 Feb 2, 2014		the alternative locations for the Proposed Project.
Judith Silverman Valley Center, CA 92082 Feb 2, 2014	195-103	The County acknowledges the commenter's
There is adequate desert land where people do not live to build these industrial power plants. Leave our communities in peace. Bonnie Gendron	195-102	opposition to the Project. The information in this
Sonia Vashel, CA 92070 Feb 2, 2014 Debbie Fishami		comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.
Jamul, CA 91935 Feb 2, 2014		·
the projects began more and more wildlife have been forced out of their territory and there are less Gold Eagles nesting. WATER!!!!! So much has been taken for the already exsisting projects and YOU plan to take	195-104	Issues raised in this comment were considered and addressed in the DPEIR. Please see Chapter 2.3, Biological Resources. The County has also found that the Project would have a less than significant impact on biological resources, including wildlife and habitat, with implementation of proposed mitigation. While the
MoveOn.org 33		Proposed Project would not physically impact mountain ranges, impacts to scenic vistas were considered and addressed in Chapter 2.1, Aesthetics. The County acknowledges that the Project would have certain significant and unavoidable impacts to scenic vistas.
	195-104	Please refer to response to comment I95-20 regarding
		potential impacts to water resources. In addition, the DPEIR considered and addressed impacts to water
		resources. Please see Chapter 3.1.5, Hydrology and Water Quality.

Hazard Severity Zone. This will a drought year not to mention the c drainages which will affect recha there water usage for ECO Sub st have used 100 million gallons an	y. This will put further wildfire danger in an area that is rated Very Hi, also reduce available water to residents and Firefightters especially in a learning of the vegetation will increase the transpiration rate, change reger area of our precious ground water. SDO&E has already under estimation. They stated in the EIR 30 million gallons for project and to date date not finished with the project. How much will this project under ter as they merely receive a waiter if they guess worn.	imated	195-105
Mark Ostrander Jacumba, CA 91934 Feb 2, 2014			1
There are plenty of sunny wide of honest and save our area.	pen spaces wise company, not money hungry bribing ones, are using.	Ве	I 195-106
Ruth Mattes Escondido, CA 92026 Feb 2, 2014			
Laci Montgomery Valley Center, CA 92082 Feb 2, 2014	2		
Jon Vick Valley Center, CA 92082 Feb 2, 2014	1		
James Thomas San Diego, CA 92101 Feb 2, 2014			
Connie Crusha El Cajon, CA 92019 Feb 2, 2014			
stunning-impossible to underestir franklin stiles El Cajon, CA 92021 Feb 2, 2014	mate the greed and ignorance of the supporters of this project		I 195-107
Remove 4 long term Supervisors	1		I 195-108
carl Meyer Potrcro, CA 91963 Feb 2, 2014			
Roy L Hales			

I95-105

Issues raised in this comment were considered and addressed in the DPEIR. Please see Chapter 3.1.4, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Chapter 3.1.7, Public Services, of the DPEIR. Please refer to the response to comment C3-4 for additional discussion related to the wildfire risk associated with the Project. The DPEIR found that the Project would have a less than significant impact related to wildfires and firefighting response capabilities.

The comment regarding the ECO Substation Project does not raise specific issues related to the adequacy of the environmental analysis in the DPEIR. The DPEIR considered and addressed impacts to water resources, including groundwater supply and drainages. Please see Chapter 3.1.5, Hydrology and Water Quality and Chapter 3.1.9, Utilities. In addition, construction and operational water demand for the Proposed Project is included in Chapter 1.0, Project Description (see Tables 1-6 and 1-7). Revisions to water demand estimates are discussed in common response WR1. The DPEIR found that the Project would have a less than significant impact on groundwater resources.

I95-106

It is unclear what the initial sentence in this comment means and therefore no response is provided. The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project.

		I95-107	This comment does not raise specific issues related to the Project or adequacy of the environmental analysis in the DPEIR; therefore, no additional response is provided or required.
Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife! Squirrel Cove, Canada Feb 2, 2014 Robert Pickerill Orlando, Fl. 32804 Feb 2, 2014		195-108	This comment does not raise specific issues related to the Project or adequacy of the environmental analysis in the DPEIR; therefore, no additional response is provided or required.
retired to the mis so that I could get away from all this. putting these projects this far away from the people that want it is crazy. If you're going to put it a long ways from the citys then put it in the dessert. don't ruin the beauty for our mis. joe marshall jacumba, CA 91934 Feb 1, 2014 Alberto Rojas EI Cajon, CA 9021 Feb 1, 2014 Pat Holtwick	I 195-109	195-109	The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The information in this letter will be provided in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.
CAMPO, CA 91906 Feb 1, 2014 David Secor El Cajon, CA 92021 Feb 1, 2014 Energy production should be as close as possible to the end user! Energy is lost as it moves along transmission lines!! Dr. Bonnie B. Price La Mesa, CA 91942] I95-110	195-110	Please refer to Common Response ALT2 regarding the commenter's preference for distributed generation energy projects.
Enough is enough Natin about San Diego, CA 92110 Feb 1, 2014 Robert Maupin Boulevard, CA 91905 Feb 1, 2014 Enough is enough Nadin abbott San Diego, CA 92110 Feb 1, 2014	[I95-111	195-111	This comment does not raise specific issues related to the Project or adequacy of the environmental analysis in the DPEIR; therefore, no additional response is provided or required.
MoveOn.org 35			

October 2015 7345 195-47

	CPartland cos, CA 92078 114	
Tammy I Boulevar Feb 1, 20	d, CA 91905	
Kristy Da Boulevar Feb 1, 20	d, CA 91905	
	Daubach d, CA 91905	
Sherry D Boulevar Feb 1, 20	d, CA 91905	
Ken Dau Boulevar Feb 1, 20	d, CA 91905	
		1020
inappropriate in t lots, at universitii already disturbed health jeopardize "green" in many l	stroy trust and witderness areas with projects that should be deemed industrial and hese places. Instead you should have incentitives for solar on shopping mall roofs, parking es, community colleges, government buildings, large corporations, industrial parke and lands. We don't need 'jobn' at the expense of people whose communities will be ruined, dt, and our wildlife exterminated. Soitec's products are wrong for this region. We can go exter ways. I love going to these beautiful places like McCain Valley and rid-don't ruin them.	[195-112] 195-113
inappropriate in t lots, at universitii already disturbed health jeopardize "green" in many l Jacumba/Bouleva Miriam F	hese places. Instead you should have incentives for solar on shopping mall roofs, parking ex, community colleges, government buildings, large corporations, industrial parks and lands. We don't need "jobs" at the expense of people whose communities will be ruined, d, and our wildlife exterminated. Softee's products are wrong for this region. We can go setter ways. I love going to these beautiful places like McCain Valley and trd-don't ruin them!	[195-112 [195-113
inappropriate in to lots, at universiti in to lots, at universiti in the lots, at universiti in the lots, and in the lots and lot	hese places. Instead you should have incentives for solar on shopping mall roofs, parking es, community colleges, government buildings, large corporations, industrial parks and lands. We don't need 'jobs' at the expense of people whose communities will be ruined, and our wildlife exterminated. Solties's products are wrong for this region. We can go extert ways. I love going to these beautiful places like McCain Valley and and on't ruin them! Laftery CA 91941 14	I 195-113
inappropriate in tolots, at universitii already disturbed health jeopardize "green" in many Jacumba/Boulevs Miriam R La Mesa, Feb 1, 20 Water is too valucan't afford to wa	hese places. Instead you should have incentives for solar on shopping mall roofs, parking es, community colleges, governmen buildings, large corporations, industrial parks and lands. We don't need "jobs" at the expense of people whose communities will be ruined, and our wildlife exterminated. Soltee's products are wrong for this region. We can go setter ways. I love going to these beautiful places like McCain Valley and trd-don't ruin them! taftery CA 91941 14 able to waste on these projects that will fade away with time. California is in a drought, we ste water.	I 195-113
inappropriate in t lots, at universitii already disturbed health jeopardize "green" in mark Jacumba/Bouleva Miriam R La Mesa, Feb 1, 20 Water is too valu- can't afford to wa Parke Ew Ocotillo, Feb 1, 20	hese places. Instead you should have incentives for solar on shopping mall roofs, parking es, community colleges, governmen buildings, large corporations, industrial parks and lands. We don't need "jobs" at the expense of people whose communities will be ruined, and our wildlife exterminated. Soltee's products are wrong for this region. We can go setter ways. I love going to these beautiful places like McCain Valley and trd-don't ruin them! taftery CA 91941 14 able to waste on these projects that will fade away with time. California is in a drought, we ste water.	
inappropriate in to lots, at universiti already disturbed health jeopardize, "green" in many J Jacumba/Bouleve Miriam E La Mesa, Feb 1, 20 Water is too valu- can't afford to wa Parke Ew Ocotillo, Feb 1, 20 I vote NO PROJE	hese places. Instead you should have incentives for solar on shopping mall roofs, parking es, community colleges, government buildings, large corporations, industrial parks and lands. We don't need "jobs" at the expense of people whose communities will be ruined, d., and our wildlife exterminated. Soitee's products are wrong for this region. We can go exter ways. I love going to these beautiful places like McCain Valley and rid-don't ruin them! tastery CA 91941 14 able to waste on these projects that will fade away with time. California is in a drought, we stee water. ing CA 92259 14 CCT to East County Soitec Solar Project. How about putting it in Del Mar ca. a CA 91934	☐ 195-112 ☐ 195-113 ☐ 195-114

I95-112 Please refer to comment I95-25 regarding the DPEIR and conclusions regarding the Proposed Projects' consistency with local land use regulations including the General Plan. Please also refer to Common Response ALT2 regarding the commenter's preference for distributed generation energy projects.

Issues raised in this comment were considered and addressed in the DPEIR. See Chapter 3.1.4, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Section 2.3, Biological Resources.

- **I95-113** The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The information in this comment will be provided in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.
- I95-114 The DPEIR considered and addressed impacts to water resources. Please see Chapter 3.1.5, Hydrology and Water Quality. In addition, please refer to response to comment I95-20 regarding potential impacts to groundwater resources.
- **I95-115** The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The information in this letter will be provided in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.

Save San Diego County's Aquifers and Wildlife! as an organic farmer in the area the amount of water needed for ever for this project will deplete our aquifers. California is in a drought, don't contribute by wasting water for these projects. Infact, all water using 195-116 construction should stop! ellen woodward-taylor Boulevard, CA 91905 Feb 1, 2014 Jacumba, CA 91934 Feb 1, 2014 Anita M Griffin Jacumba, CA 91934 Feb 1, 2014 We really need to SLOW track these projects in time of drought. The PEIR MUST be handled in a methodical way or we are in danger of creating a wasteland in our county. Let's be sensible and cautious when approving something that has been unproven on such a large scale and that adversely affects our precious resources 195-117 (water, wildlife and endangered Chapparal. Jacumba Hot Springs, CA 91934 Feb 1, 2014 Citizens Against Back Country Destruction United States Feb 1, 2014

MoveOn.org

I95-116 The DPEIR considered and addressed impacts to water resources. Please see Chapter 3.1.5, Hydrology and Water Quality. In addition, please refer to response to comment I95-20 regarding potential impacts to groundwater resources.

195-117 The DPEIR considered and addressed impacts to water resources and biological resources. Please see Chapter 3.1.5, Hydrology and Water Quality and Chapter 2.3, Biological Resources. In addition, please refer to response to comment 195-20 regarding potential impacts to groundwater resources. The DPEIR determined that the Project would have a less than significant impact on groundwater and also found that the Project would have a less than significant impact on biological resources, including wildlife and vegetation communities, with implementation of proposed mitigation.

In conformance with CEQA, the DPEIR evaluated the whole of the action and analyzed each environmental subject area with regard to potential adverse effects, as well as a reasonable range of alternatives. The DPEIR is consistent with the County's EIR Format and General Content Requirements, dated September 26, 2006.

October 2015

7345

	Howard Cook <howwcook@yahoo.com></howwcook@yahoo.com>
Sent: To:	Friday, February 21, 2014 9:45 PM Hingtgen, Robert J
Cc:	Howard Cook; Donna Tisdale These and Approximately 300 names not shown on the Administrative Record
Subject:	These and Approximately 300 names not shown on the Administrative Record
Robert,	
	d approximately 300 additional names and comments are missing from the Soited Iministrative Record. Please let us know why they are not appearing on the
	ecord for this project?
Thank You,	1 1 111100 1 0
Howard W Cook	k, Jacumba Hot Springs, CA
MoveOn.org	
TART A PETITION MA	NACE DETITIONS
 APPLY FOR CAMPAIGN 	
ABOUT	TIPS
DONATE	
SIGN THIS PETT	CION
[][] [United States V][][] [State V][]
SIGN THE PE	TITION NO DELECTION
Note: By signing, you unsubscribe at any til	u agree to receive email messages from MoveOn.org Civic Action and MoveOn.org Political Action. You may me. [Privacy policy]
EMBED THIS PE	PITION
	p://petitions.moveon.org/embed/widget.html?v=3iname=save-san-diego-countys=
class="moveon-pe	etition" id="petition-embed" width="300px" height="500px">

I95-118 This comment is introductory in nature and does not raise an environmental issue for which a response is required.

October 2015 7345

195-118

Please vote "NO PROJECT" to the proposed East County Soitec Solar Project. The "No Project alternative" Is the only recommendation possible at this time. Project size, severe environmental impacts, experimental nature of the CPV product, major impacts to water aquifers; the rushed broadbrush nature of the more important EIR parts makes this the only alternative possible at this time.

Your choice to use the "Fast Track" method, requested in the 03/05/2012 Soitec letter to Chairman Roberts has resulted in an EIR containing many factual errors and omissions as will be reflected in the EIR citizen comments. The project and its EIR must be reworked, reanalyzed using normal non fast track processes.

Our San Diego environment is far more important than the profits or cash flow of the French Soitec Company and the project's absentee landowners. Support solar in urban environments where power is used and on reclaimed/contaminated lands – not on wetlands, in wildlife habitat, along scenic highways or in communities valued for their rural character.

There are currently 308 signatures. NEW goal - We need 400 signatures!

PETITION BACKGROUND

On January 2, 2014 The County of San Diego released an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) covering a massive industrial solar (CPV tracker technology) project destined for the Boulevard area of the County. 7,500 of these trackers are proposed at four sites covering 1500 acres; three of the sites border Scenic designated Interstate 8 and Historic Old

195-122

195-123

195-120

195-121

195-119 The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The information in this comment will be provided in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.

In conformance with CEQA, the DPEIR evaluated the whole of the action and analyzed each environmental subject area (including hydrology and water quality – see Chapter 3.1.5) with regard to potential adverse effects, as well as a reasonable range of alternatives. The DPEIR is consistent with the County's EIR Format and General Content Requirements, dated September 26, 2006. The County disagrees with the characterization of the DPEIR as an impermissible "broad-brush" review. The four solar farms comprising the Proposed Project is the type of action for which a Program EIR may be prepared, as outlined in Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines, in that they are related geographically, and are logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions. Related to the commenter's assertion that the DPEIR was "rushed," please refer to the response to comment I95-120.

195-120 The County disagrees with the commenter's assertion that it has allowed the "fast tracking" of the Proposed Project. The application for the Proposed Project has been processed by the County according to the County Zoning Ordinance and related regulations.

October 2015 7345

In conformance with CEQA, the DPEIR evaluated the whole of the action and analyzed each environmental subject area with regard to potential adverse effects, as well as a reasonable range of alternatives. The DPEIR is consistent with the County's EIR Format and General Content Requirements, dated September 26, 2006.

- **195-121** The County acknowledges this comment, which does not raise an environmental issue relative to the DPEIR.
- 195-122 Please refer to Common Response ALT2 regarding the commenter's preference for distributed generation energy projects. Also, issues raised in this comment were considered and addressed in the DPEIR. Please see Chapter 2.3, Biological Resources, Chapter 2.1, Aesthetics, and Chapter 2.5, Land Use and Planning.
- I95-123 The comment restates information contained in Chapter 1.0, Project Description, of the DPEIR. This comment does not raise specific issues related to the adequacy of the environmental analysis in the DPEIR; therefore, no additional response is provided or required.

Highway 80. Each of the Soitec trackers is 30 feet high and fifty feet wide. Despite being promoted as green, the project would be an "environmental catastrophe" on many levels as follows:

- Unprecedented size and density of massive trackers will industrialize this scenic rurual area lining Old Highway 80, a state designated scenic highway and the entry to McCain Valley, a federal public recreation area. Bulldozing will destroy sensitive plants and wetlands, meadows, wildlife habitat and scenic views.
- French developer Soitec and San Diego County are betting on 7,500 unproven CPV units, not yet commercially operational for any significant period at any other U.S. site. This fasttracked project is due to start this year and doesn't allow time for a careful environmental impact study.
- Millions, perhaps even a billion gallons of water will be needed to construct this project and more water will be pumped to constantly clean and rinse these trackers. This heavy water use threatens to drain our aquifers—our sole sources of drinking water—all the way to Borrego Valley and turn much of the San Diego high back country into a desert. It's outrageous to risk having residents' wells run dry or water sources for wildlife dry up, given that we're in the worst drought in California history and our Governor has declared a drought emergency. We should conserve our precious water resources.
- Lack of water will impoverish people and devastate abundant wildlife including "endangered" Peninsular Bighorn Sheep, Golden Eagles, Borrego Pupfish and others that are "Species of Special Concern." Deer, bobcat and mountain lions are also found in this area.
- Glare will invade the land and create safety hazards and ruin vistas on I-8 and Old 80. These massive glaring panels are proposed just 100 feet from homes, some surrounded on two, three or even four sides. In the Mojave Desert community of Newbury Springs, Supervisors passed a moratorium to protect residents from glare due to impacts of large solar projects there. It's wrong to force residents who value rural tranquility to be thrust into the middle of an industrial energy zone.
- A project isn't "green" if it endangers wildlife, destroys ecosystems and rural communities' character. Solar panels belong in the urban environment where power is used – on rooftops and parking lots, or on reclaimed sites such as former landfills – not on wild and scenic lands

Issues raised in this comment were considered and addressed in the DPEIR. Please see Chapter 2.1, Aesthetics and Chapter 2.3, Biological Resources. The County acknowledges that the Project would have certain significant and unavoidable impacts related to scenic vistas, but disagrees with the commenter's characterization of the Project as industrialization of the area. The DPEIR found that with the implementation of mitigation the Project would have a less than significant impact on biological resources, including sensitive plants, wetlands, meadows, and wildlife habitat.

I95-125 The County appreciates this information and will take it into consideration. This information, however, would not affect the analysis in the DPEIR.

The County disagrees with the commenter's assertion that it has allowed the "fast tracking" of the Proposed Project. The application for the Proposed Project has been processed by the County according to the County Zoning Ordinance and related regulations.

Issues raised in this comment were considered and addressed in the DPEIR. Please see Chapter 3.1.5, Hydrology and Water Quality and Chapter 3.1.9, Utilities. In addition, Chapter 1.0, Project Description, describes the anticipated construction and operational water demand of the Proposed Project. Lastly, please refer to response to comment I95-20 regarding potential impacts to groundwater resources.

October 2015 7345

195-123

195-124

195-125

195-126

195-127

195-128

195-129

Cont

Issues raised in this comment were considered and addressed in the DPEIR. Please see Chapter 2.3, Biological Resources. Please also refer to responses O7-8 through O7-12. In addition, as stated in response I105-1, the County of San Diego will place conditions on the Major Use Permit that will restrict the amount of water that is permitted to be withdrawn from the on-site wells in order to prevent interference with off-site wells. Because water use will be restricted, residual effects to wildlife species or off-site wells are not anticipated to occur.

Glare was considered and addressed in the DPEIR. Please see Chapter 2.1, Aesthetics. The County acknowledges that the Project would have certain significant and unavoidable impacts related to scenic vistas and glare. The comment regarding the Newberry Solar 1 site is acknowledged and will be included in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not raise an environmental issue specific to the DPEIR for which a response is required.

I95-129 The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Project. The information in this comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.

Please refer to Common Response ALT2 regarding the commenter's preference for distributed generation energy projects.

In addition, see response to comment I95-25 regarding

the DPEIR and conclusions regarding the Proposed Projects' consistency with local land use regulations including the General Plan. **I95-130** The County acknowledges the petition and individual that must be bulldozed to industrialize rural America. Our town is a canary in a coal mine signers of the petition. Where comments have been County Supervisors gutted our community plan over the objections of our planning group 195-129 and residents—and the Soitec project is just one of several Goliath-scale energy projects submitted in the petition, a response has been Cont. proposed to decimate our wild and scenic places. provided. CURRENT PETITION SIGNERS 195-130 . 308. Sandy Zelasko from Valley Center, CA signed this petition on Feb 21, 2014. 195-131 This comment is a duplicate of comment I95-5. Please **I95-131** . 307. Carol Fasching from Alpine, CA signed this petition on Feb 21, 2014. see response to comment I95-5. . 306. S Hoggard from San Diego, CA signed this petition on Feb 21, 2014. . 305. Sheri Vandeventer from Valley Center, CA signed this petition on Feb 20, 2014. . 304. Anne Bessinger from Alpine, CA signed this petition on Feb 20, 2014. **I95-132** This comment is a duplicate of comment 195-6. Please . 303. M. A. Mareck from Escondido, CA signed this petition on Feb 19, 2014. see response to comment I95-6. . 302. Anne M Casey from San Diego, CA signed this petition on Feb 19, 2014. 195-132 This comment is a duplicate of comments I95-7, I95-8 **I95-133** • 301. Kathleen from El Cajon, CA signed this petition on Feb 17, 2014. and I95-9. Please see the responses to comments I95-. 300. Steven Rosefeld from Escondido, CA signed this petition on Feb 16, 2014. . 299. Jan Hedlun from Potrero, CA signed this petition on Feb 16, 2014. 7, I95-8 and I95-9. 195-133 Note: MoveOn Civic Action does not necessarily endorse the contents of petitions posted on this site. MoveOn Petitions is an open tool that anyone can use to post a petition advocating any point of view, so long as the petition does not violate our terms of service. MoveOn.org®

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

October 2015 Final PEIR 7345